Message

From: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]

Sent: 10/6/2021 12:40:37 PM

To: Nguyen, Thuy [Nguyen.Thuy@epa.gov]
CC: Nesci, Kimberly [Nesci.Kimberly@epa.gov]

Subject: RE: OPP IO review RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Thanks Thuy. I think we are ok right now with the response that was sent already since the samples were from stainless steel containers. If we are asked to clarify, we can go into the details of collecting and receiving.

From: Nguyen, Thuy <Nguyen.Thuy@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 8:35 AM
To: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Cc: Nesci, Kimberly <Nesci.Kimberly@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OPP IO review RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Shamus

Do you want to revise our response to include all the information about how Permanone samples were collected and received?

If so, let me know.

Thanks Thuy

From: Nguyen, Thuy

Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 8:26 AM **To:** Ozmen, Shamus < Ozmen. Shamus@epa.gov > Cc: Nesci, Kimberly < Nesci. Kimberly@epa.gov >

Subject: RE: OPP IO review RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Hi Shamus

I know it's a little confusing.

The Anvil samples were sent to our lab in Clarke 2.5 gallon end-user fluorinated HDPE containers. The MDA Permanone samples were taken from a 250-gallon stainless steel storage tank, put into a 30 ml polypropylene bottles and sent to us. That's why in my response I said "MDA samples were taken from 250-gallon stainless steel container".

Bayer did send us a Permanone sample in a 5-gallon end-user stainless steel container, which we also tested and found no PFAS (targeted PFAS).

Thuy

From: Ozmen, Shamus < Ozmen. Shamus@epa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 8:07 AM **To:** Nguyen, Thuy < Nguyen, Thuy@epa.gov > **Cc:** Nesci, Kimberly < Nesci, Kimberly@epa.gov >

Subject: RE: OPP IO review RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Thanks Thuy. I appreciate the confirmation. I was asking because our written response says Permanone samples were from stainless steel but when I read the report I thought it was saying the samples were from polypropylene [plastic] containers.

From: Nguyen, Thuy < Nguyen. Thuy @epa.gov > Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 7:27 PM

To: Ozmen, Shamus < <u>Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov</u>> **Cc:** Nesci, Kimberly < <u>Nesci.Kimberly@epa.gov</u>>

Subject: Re: OPP IO review RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Hi Shamus

Yes, polypropylene is a type of plastic. Just like HDPE, unless it's fluorinated, it is not a source of PFAS contamination. The polypropylene bottles we got from MDA are not fluorinated.

Hope I answer your question Thuy

On Oct 5, 2021, at 5:15 PM, Ozmen, Shamus < Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov> wrote:

Many thanks again for the quick reviews.

For just my edification and apologies for a dumb question, what do we mean in the report when we say polypropylene: "These samples were received in 30-ml polypropylene containers..." and "the ACB received from MDA an unused 30-ml polypropylene sample container"? Isn't that a type of plastic?

Thanks, Shamus

From: Nesci, Kimberly < Nesci. Kimberly@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 1:27 PM

To: Ozmen, Shamus < Ozmen. Shamus@epa.gov >; Nguyen, Thuy < Nguyen. Thuy@epa.gov >; Messina,

Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>

Cc: Anderson, Neil < Anderson. Neil@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OPP IO review RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Yes, thank you, Thuy!

From: Ozmen, Shamus < Ozmen. Shamus@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 12:45 PM

To: Nguyen, Thuy < Nguyen. Thuy @epa.gov>; Messina, Edward < Messina. Edward @epa.gov>; Nesci,

Kimberly <Nesci.Kimberly@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>

Cc: Anderson, Neil < Anderson. Neil@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OPP IO review RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Thanks Thuy.

I'll forward the revised response:

The Permanone 30-30 samples were not in the same type of containers as were the samples for the Anvil 10+10 product. The Permanone samples were taken from stainless steel containers and the Anvil samples were taken from fluorinated HDPE containers.

From: Nguyen, Thuy < Nguyen. Thuy @epa.gov > Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 12:33 PM

To: Messina, Edward < Messina. Edward@epa.gov >; Ozmen, Shamus < Ozmen. Shamus@epa.gov >; Nesci,

Kimberly < Nesci. Kimberly@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael < Goodis. Michael@epa.gov>

Cc: Anderson, Neil < Anderson. Neil@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OPP IO review RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Ed – sorry, Can I propose some [late] changes?

Response:

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Thanks

Thuy

From: Messina, Edward < Messina. Edward@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 12:27 PM

To: Ozmen, Shamus < Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov >; Nesci, Kimberly < Nesci.Kimberly@epa.gov >; Goodis,

Michael < Goodis. Michael@epa.gov>

Cc: Anderson, Neil < Anderson. Neil@epa.gov>; Nguyen, Thuy < Nguyen. Thuy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Approved.

Ed Massina Esa

Ed Messina, Esq.
Director, Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.

washington, D.C. p: (703) 347-0209

From: Ozmen, Shamus < Ozmen. Shamus@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 8:06 AM

To: Nesci, Kimberly < Nesci.Kimberly@epa.gov >; Messina, Edward < Messina.Edward@epa.gov >; Goodis, Michael < Goodis.Michael@epa.gov >

Cc: Anderson, Neil <<u>Anderson.Neil@epa.gov</u>>; Nguyen, Thuy <<u>Nguyen.Thuy@epa.gov</u>> **Subject:** OPP IO review RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Thanks Kimberly. OPA may not pursue the background interview since any new information we have is posted online now (the method and MD test results).

For the reporter's question regarding if the MA and MD containers were the same, is this response approved:

From: Nesci, Kimberly < Nesci.Kimberly@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 3:30 PM

To: Ozmen, Shamus < <u>Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov</u>>; Messina, Edward < <u>Messina.Edward@epa.gov</u>>; Goodis, Michael < Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>

Cc: Anderson, Neil < Anderson. Neil@epa.gov >; Nguyen, Thuy < Nguyen. Thuy@epa.gov >

Subject: RE: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

The containers were not the same as the Mass containers. The MD containers (for Permanone) were stainless steel. I can do tomorrow or Wed, with some exceptions (OPP General, ESA meetings, and 10:25 on Wednesday for a conversation with Region 3).

Can we get questions in advance? I expect technical questions around what changed for the MD samples (since initial results said yes – I think we note that in the report).

From: Ozmen, Shamus < Ozmen. Shamus@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 2:45 PM

To: Messina, Edward <Messina. Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis. Michael@epa.gov>; Nesci,

Kimberly < Nesci. Kimberly@epa.gov>

Subject: E&E request for PFAS background/off-the-record interview

Importance: High

Hi Ed and Kimberly,

Ariel Wittenberg of E&E News would like to have a background interview to better understand the fluorination issue and PFAS and the MD samples. This would be similar to the interview you two had with Pat Rizzuto/Bloomberg last March, with the point of providing an education rather than a particular storyline yet. Would you feel comfortable with this? If yes, would tomorrow or Wednesday be a possibility (I'll also check with Ann).

Also, Ariel would like know if the containers for the MA samples were the same in any way with MD samples – type of HDPE, same manufacturer, same fluorination or other fluorination?

Thank you,

Shamus Ozmen Communications Branch Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Mobile: (571) 442-9844